

AGENDA

Administrative Committee Meeting

September 20, 2006

11:00 a.m.

Location

SANBAG

Super Chief Conference Room

1170 W. 3rd Street, 2nd Floor

San Bernardino, CA

Administrative Committee Membership

Chair – SANBAG Vice President

Council Member Jim Lindley
City of Hesperia

SANBAG President

Supervisor Dennis Hansberger
County of San Bernardino

SANBAG Past President

Supervisor Paul Biane
County of San Bernardino

Mt./Desert Representatives

Mayor Pro Tem Rick Roelle
Town of Apple Valley

Council Member Darrell Mulvihill
City of Big Bear Lake

Supervisor Bill Postmus
County of San Bernardino

East Valley Representatives

Mayor Pro Tem Bea Cortes
City of Grand Terrace

Mayor Bob Christman
City of Loma Linda

Supervisor Josie Gonzales
County of San Bernardino

West Valley Representatives

Council Member Gwenn Norton-Perry
City of Chino Hills

Mayor Paul Eaton
City of Montclair

Supervisor Gary Ovitt
County of San Bernardino

San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) is a council of governments formed in 1973 by joint powers agreement of the cities and the County of San Bernardino. SANBAG is governed by a Board of Directors consisting of a mayor or designated council member from each of the twenty-four cities in San Bernardino County and the five members of the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors.

In addition to SANBAG, the composition of the SANBAG Board of Directors also serves as the governing board for several separate legal entities listed below:

***The San Bernardino County Transportation Commission**, which is responsible for short and long range transportation planning within San Bernardino County, including coordination and approval of all public mass transit service, approval of all capital development projects for public transit and highway projects, and determination of staging and scheduling of construction relative to all transportation improvement projects in the Transportation Improvement Program.*

***The San Bernardino County Transportation Authority**, which is responsible for administration of the voter-approved half-cent transportation transactions and use tax levied in the County of San Bernardino.*

***The Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies**, which is responsible for the administration and operation of a motorist aid system of call boxes on State freeways and highways within San Bernardino County.*

***The Congestion Management Agency**, which analyzes the performance level of the regional transportation system in a manner which ensures consideration of the impacts from new development and promotes air quality through implementation of strategies in the adopted air quality plans.*

*As a **Subregional Planning Agency**, SANBAG represents the San Bernardino County subregion and assists the Southern California Association of Governments in carrying out its functions as the metropolitan planning organization. SANBAG performs studies and develops consensus relative to regional growth forecasts, regional transportation plans, and mobile source components of the air quality plans.*

Items which appear on the monthly Board of Directors agenda are subjects of one or more of the listed legal authorities. For ease of understanding and timeliness, the agenda items for all of these entities are consolidated on one agenda. Documents contained in the agenda package are clearly marked with the appropriate legal entity.

**San Bernardino Associated Governments
County Transportation Commission
County Transportation Authority
Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies
County Congestion Management Agency**

AGENDA

Administrative Committee Meeting

**September 20, 2006
11:00 a.m.**

Location: SANBAG, Super Chief Conference Room, 1170 W. 3rd Street, 2nd Floor,
San Bernardino

CALL TO ORDER 11:00 a.m.
(Meeting Chaired by Council Member Jim Lindley)

- I. Attendance
- II. Announcements
- III. Agenda Notices/Modifications – Anna Aldana

1. Possible Conflict of Interest Issues for the Administrative Committee Meeting September 20, 2006. Pg. 5

Note agenda item contractors, subcontractors and agents which may require member abstentions due to conflict of interest and financial interests. Board Member abstentions shall be stated under this item for recordation on the appropriate item.

Consent Calendar

Consent Calendar items shall be adopted by a single vote unless removed by member request.

Administrative Matters

2. Attendance Register Pg. 6

A quorum shall consist of a majority of the membership of each SANBAG Policy Committee, except that all County Representatives shall be counted as one for the purpose of establishing a quorum.

Notes/Actions

Consent Calendar Continued....

3. **Procurement Report for August 2006** Pg. 8
Receive Monthly Procurement Report. **Terrence J. McGuire**

Discussion Items**Administrative**

4. **Budget to Actual Report** Pg. 10
Receive Budget to Actual Report for Period Ending June 2006. **Terrence J. McGuire**
5. **SANBAG Policy Defining Employee Service Hours** Pg. 15
Approve amendments to SANBAG Policy 10107, Compensation Administration, to update definition of service hours and make technical correction. **Deborah Barmack**
6. **Termination of Lease 06-011 with Manuel Ramos, dba: Apostle Café** Pg. 18
Approve the termination of Lease 06-011 with Manuel Ramos, dba: Apostle Café. **Mike Bair**

Program Support/Council of Govts.

7. **Proposed New Local Streets Financing Program** Pg. 20
Recommend approval of the concept of the program and direct staff to further investigate implementation of the program. **Terrence J. McGuire**
8. **Request for Proposal for SANBAG Federal Advocacy Services** Pg. 26
Approve the release of a Request for Proposals (RFP): for federal advocacy services (RFP C07075) to be provided from January 2007 through December 2008. Also, authorize the SANBAG Director of Intergovernmental and Legislative Affairs to solicit for members of the selection committee. **Jennifer Franco**

Discussion Items Continued....**Program Support/Council of Govts. (Cont.)****9. 2006 November Ballot Initiatives****Pg. 40**

Adopt the recommended positions for the following statewide initiatives, which have qualified for the 2006 November General Election ballot:

1. Support Proposition 1A (Proposition 42 fix) and Proposition 1B (infrastructure bond for transportation)
2. No Position on the following Propositions:
 - Propositions 1C (infrastructure bond for housing/emergency shelters);
 - Proposition 1D (infrastructure bond for schools);
 - Proposition 1E (infrastructure bond for flood prevention);
 - Proposition 84 (bonds for assuring water quality, water supply, flood control and natural resources and parks); and
 - Proposition 87 (tax on California oil to encourage alternative energy)
3. Oppose Proposition 90 (eminent domain). **Jennifer Franco**

Comments from Committee Members**Public Comment****ADJOURNMENT****Additional Information****Acronym List****Pg. 48**

Complete packages of the SANBAG agenda are available for public review at the SANBAG offices. Staff reports for items may be made available upon request. For additional information call (909) 884-8276.

Meeting Procedures and Rules of Conduct

Meeting Procedures

The Ralph M. Brown Act is the state law which guarantees the public's right to attend and participate in meetings of local legislative bodies. These rules have been adopted by the Board of Directors in accordance with the Brown Act, Government Code 54950 et seq., and shall apply at all meetings of the Board of Directors and Policy Committees.

Accessibility

The SANBAG meeting facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. If assistive listening devices or other auxiliary aids or services are needed in order to participate in the public meeting, requests should be made through the Clerk of the Board at least three (3) business days prior to the Board meeting. The Clerk's telephone number is (909) 884-8276 and office is located at 1170 W. 3rd Street, 2nd Floor, San Bernardino, CA.

Agendas – All agendas are posted at 1170 W. 3rd Street, 2nd Floor, San Bernardino at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. Staff reports related to agenda items may be reviewed at the SANBAG offices located at 1170 W. 3rd Street, 2nd Floor, San Bernardino and our website: www.sanbag.ca.gov.

Agenda Actions – Items listed on both the "Consent Calendar" and "Items for Discussion" contain suggested actions. The Board of Directors will generally consider items in the order listed on the agenda. However, items may be considered in any order. New agenda items can be added and action taken by two-thirds vote of the Board of Directors.

Closed Session Agenda Items – Consideration of closed session items *excludes* members of the public. These items include issues related to personnel, pending litigation, labor negotiations and real estate negotiations. Prior to each closed session, the Chair will announce the subject matter of the closed session. If action is taken in closed session, the Chair may report the action to the public at the conclusion of the closed session.

Public Testimony on an Item – Members of the public are afforded an opportunity to speak on any listed item. Individuals wishing to address the Board of Directors or Policy Committee Members should complete a "Request to Speak" form, provided at the rear of the meeting room, and present it to the Clerk prior to the Board's consideration of the item. A "Request to Speak" form must be completed for *each* item an individual wishes to speak on. When recognized by the Chair, speakers should be prepared to step forward and announce their name and address for the record. In the interest of facilitating the business of the Board, speakers are limited to three (3) minutes on each item. Additionally, a twelve (12) minute limitation is established for the total amount of time any one individual may address the Board at any one meeting. The Chair or a majority of the Board may establish a different time limit as appropriate, and parties to agenda items shall not be subject to the time limitations.

The Consent Calendar is considered a single item, thus the three (3) minute rule applies. Consent Calendar items can be pulled at Board member request and will be brought up individually at the specified time in the agenda allowing further public comment on those items.

Agenda Times – The Board is concerned that discussion take place in a timely and efficient manner. Agendas may be prepared with estimated times for categorical areas and certain topics to be discussed. These times may vary according to the length of presentation and amount of resulting discussion on agenda items.

Public Comment – At the end of the agenda, an opportunity is also provided for members of the public to speak on any subject within the Board's authority. *Matters raised under "Public Comment" may not be acted upon at that meeting. "Public Testimony on any Item" still apply.*

Disruptive Conduct – If any meeting of the Board is willfully disrupted by a person or by a group of persons so as to render the orderly conduct of the meeting impossible, the Chair may recess the meeting or order the person, group or groups of person willfully disrupting the meeting to leave the meeting or to be removed from the meeting. Disruptive conduct includes addressing the Board without first being recognized, not addressing the subject before the Board, repetitiously addressing the same subject, failing to relinquish the podium when requested to do so, or otherwise preventing the Board from conducting its meeting in an orderly manner. *Please be aware that a NO SMOKING policy has been established for meetings. Your cooperation is appreciated!*

- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
■ San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 1

Date: September 20, 2006

Subject: Information Relative to Possible Conflict of Interest

Recommendation*: Note agenda items and contractors/subcontractors which may require member abstentions due to possible conflicts of interest.

Background: In accordance with California Government Code 84308, members of the Board of Directors may not participate in any action concerning a contract where they have received a campaign contribution of more than \$250 in the prior twelve months from an entity or individual. This agenda contains recommendations for action relative to the following contractors:

| Item No. | Contract No. | Contractor/Agents | Subcontractors |
|----------|--------------|-------------------|----------------|
| | | None | |

Financial Impact: This item has no direct impact on the 2006/2007 Budget.

Reviewed By: This item is prepared monthly for review by the Board of Directors and policy committee members.

Approved
Administrative Committee

Date:

Moved:

Second:

In Favor:

Opposed:

Abstained:

Witnessed: _____

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE ROSTER - 2006

| Name | Jan | Feb | March | April | May | June | July* | Aug | Sept | Oct | Nov | Dec |
|--------------------|-----|-----|-------|-------|-----|------|-------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|
| Paul Biane | | X | | X | X | | | X | | | | |
| Kelly Chastain | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | |
| Robert Christman | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X | | | | |
| Bea Cortes | X | X | X | X | | X | | X | | | | |
| Paul Eaton | X | X | | | X | | | X | | | | |
| Josie Gonzales | X | | | | | X | | X | | | | |
| James Lindley | X | | | X | X | X | | X | | | | |
| Dennis Hansberger | X | X | X | X | | X | | | | | | |
| Darrell Mulvihill | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| Gary Ovitt | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gwenn Norton-Perry | | X | | X | | X | | X | | | | |
| Bill Postmus | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| Rick Roelle | X | X | X | X | X | | | X | | | | |

The crossed-out boxes indicate members who were not on the committee as of that month.

The empty boxes indicate member who did not attend the meeting that month.

*The Administrative Committee did not meet in July.

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE ROSTER - 2005

| Name | Jan | Feb* | March | April | May | June | July | Aug | Sept | Oct | Nov | Dec |
|--------------------|-----|------|-------|-------|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|
| Paul Biane | X | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Kelly Chastain | X | | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Robert Christman | | | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | |
| Bea Cortes | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X |
| Paul Eaton | X | | X | X | | X | | | X | X | X | X |
| Josie Gonzales | X | | | X | X | X | X | | | | X | X |
| James Lindley | X | | | | | X | | X | X | X | X | X |
| Dennis Hansberger | | | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X |
| Gary Ovitt | X | | | X | X | | | X | X | X | X | X |
| Gwenn Norton-Perry | X | | | X | | X | X | X | | | X | |
| Bill Postmus | | | | X | X | X | X | X | | | X | X |
| Rick Roelle | | | X | | X | X | X | X | | | X | |

The crossed-out boxes indicate members who were not on the committee as of that month.

The empty boxes indicate member who did not attend the meeting that month.

*The Administrative Committee did not meet in February.

- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
■ San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 3

Date: September 20, 2006

Subject: Procurement Report for August 2006

Recommendation:* Receive Monthly Procurement Report.

Background: The Board of Directors approved the Contracting and Procurement Policy (Policy No. 11000) on January 3, 1997. The Executive Director, or his designee, is authorized to approve Purchase Orders up to an amount of \$25,000. All procurements for supplies and services approved by the Executive Director, or his designee, in excess of \$5,000 shall be routinely reported to the Administrative Committee and to the Board of Directors.

Attached are the purchase orders in excess of \$5,000 to be reported to the Administrative Committee for the month of August 2006.

Financial Impact: This item imposes no impact on the FY 2006/07 Budget. Presentation of the monthly procurement report will demonstrate compliance with the Contracting and Procurement Policy (Policy No. 11000).

Reviewed By: This item is scheduled for review by the Administrative Committee on September 20, 2006.

Responsible Staff: Terrence J. McGuire, Chief Financial Officer

*

ADM0609a-tjm.doc
ISF07

Approved
Administrative Committee

Date: _____

Moved: _____ Second: _____

In Favor: _____ Opposed: _____ Abstained: _____

Witnessed: _____

PURCHASE ORDERS ISSUED FOR AUGUST 2006

| P.O. # | Vendor | Purpose | Sole Source Y/N | Amount |
|--------|--------------------|---|-----------------|------------------|
| 07069 | Robert Wirts, P.E. | On-call Congestion Mgmt. Program Support Services | Y | \$ 20,000 |
| | | | | |
| | | TOTAL PURCHASE ORDERS ISSUED | | \$ 20,000 |

- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
■ San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 4

Date: September 20, 2006

Subject: Budget to Actual Report

Recommendation:* Receive Budget to Actual Report for Period Ending June, 2006

Background: SANBAG's Budget for Fiscal Year 2006-2007 for new activity was adopted by the Board of Directors on June 7, 2006. Upon Finalization of the SANBAG audit, the encumbrances (commitments related to unperformed contracts for goods or services from the previous Fiscal Years) are also presented for approval to be formally incorporated into the FY 2006-2007 Budget.

The following attachment provides a summary of program activity and task activity compared to the approved budget. Columns indicating the original budget, amended budget, total budget and year to date expenditures are identified.

Financial Impact: This item reports the status of expenditures against budget. The encumbrances for the associated expenditures have been included in and are consistent with the FY 2006-2007 Budget.

Reviewed By: This item is scheduled for review by the Administrative Committee on September 20, 2006.

Responsible Staff: Terrence J. McGuire, Chief Financial Officer

*

Approved
Administrative Committee

Date: _____

Moved:

Second:

In Favor:

Opposed:

Abstained:

Witnessed: _____

San Bernardino Associated Governments Budget to Actual - Fiscal Year 2005-2006 Consolidated by Program

09/13/2006 11:51 AM

PERIOD: July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006

FISCAL YEAR: July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006

| TASK DESCRIPTION | ORIGINAL BUDGET | BUDGET AMENDMENTS | ENCUMB. | TOTAL BUDGET | EXPEND. | BALANCE OF TASK |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------------|
| TOTAL REGIONAL & QUALITY OF LIFE PROGRAM | 3,562,214 | 929,925 | 2,967,902 | 7,460,041 | 5,476,510 | 1,983,531 |
| TOTAL SUBREG. TRANS. PLANNING & PROGRAMMING | 5,738,545 | 1,497,819 | 960,826 | 8,197,190 | 2,299,792 | 5,897,398 |
| TOTAL PROJECT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM | 140,507,756 | 17,997,120 | 106,757,797 | 265,262,673 | 140,476,326 | 124,786,347 |
| TOTAL TRANSIT/COMMUTER RAIL PROGRAM | 12,391,340 | 1,837,875 | 4,946,004 | 19,175,219 | 11,295,903 | 7,879,316 |
| TOTAL TRANS. PROGRAMS & FUND ADMINISTRATION | 46,605,152 | 9,281,078 | 1,076,003 | 56,962,233 | 55,794,127 | 1,168,106 |
| TOTAL PROGRAM SUPPORT / COUNCIL of GVMTS PROG. | 2,410,186 | 179,000 | 252,647 | 2,841,833 | 1,878,054 | 963,779 |
| GRAND TOTALS | 211,215,193 | 31,722,817 | 116,961,179 | 359,899,189 | 217,220,712 | 142,678,477 |

San Bernardino Associated Governments

Budget to Actual

PERIOD: July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006

FISCAL YEAR: July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006

REGIONAL & QUALITY OF LIFE PROGRAM

| TASK# | TASK DESCRIPTION | ORIGINAL BUDGET | BUDGET AMENDMENTS | ENCUMBRANCES | REVISED | TOTAL BUDGET | EXPEND. | BALANCE OF TASK | % EXPEND. |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| 0610100 | Air Quality Planning | 47,848 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 52,848 | 51,492 | 1,356 | 97.44% |
| 0610200 | Air Quality Implementation | 65,554 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65,554 | 58,286 | 7,268 | 88.91% |
| 0611000 | Regional Transportation Planning | 200,074 | -36,322 | 0 | 0 | 163,752 | 137,418 | 26,334 | 83.92% |
| 0611100 | Freight Movement | 135,770 | 93,105 | 125,000 | 0 | 353,875 | 352,052 | 1,823 | 99.48% |
| 0611200 | Regional Growth Forecast Development | 39,345 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39,345 | 32,992 | 6,353 | 83.85% |
| 0611300 | I-15 Intermodal Corridor Study | 37,338 | -5,051 | 0 | 0 | 32,287 | 12,818 | 19,469 | 39.70% |
| 0640400 | Comprehensive Transp. Plan | 175,676 | 197,182 | 114,280 | 0 | 487,138 | 254,039 | 233,099 | 52.15% |
| 0640412 | Victor Valley Transportation Plan | 313,833 | -6,060 | 0 | 0 | 307,773 | 136,366 | 171,407 | 44.31% |
| 0640500 | TMEP Program Development | 1,818 | 0 | 236,734 | 0 | 238,552 | 236,734 | 1,818 | 99.24% |
| 0640605 | Trip Reduction Management - GEN | 367,170 | -101,483 | 5,625 | 0 | 271,312 | 209,264 | 62,048 | 77.13% |
| 0640610 | Inland Empire Employer Service | 280,000 | 46,940 | 0 | 0 | 326,940 | 323,339 | 3,601 | 98.90% |
| 0640620 | Rideshare Incentive Programs | 565,000 | 25,600 | 0 | 0 | 590,600 | 470,271 | 120,329 | 79.63% |
| 0640630 | Rideshare Core Services | 309,000 | 6,700 | 0 | 0 | 315,700 | 213,074 | 102,626 | 67.49% |
| 0670200 | Call Box System | 359,528 | 250,625 | 2,361,526 | 0 | 2,971,679 | 2,144,518 | 827,161 | 72.17% |
| 0670210 | S.B. Co. Intelligent Trans. System | 108,913 | -2,817 | 0 | 0 | 106,096 | 51,854 | 54,242 | 48.87% |
| 0670400 | Motorist Aid | 483,594 | 460,363 | 124,737 | 0 | 1,068,694 | 736,749 | 331,945 | 68.94% |
| 0681200 | Clean Fuels Implementation | 71,753 | -3,857 | 0 | 0 | 67,896 | 55,245 | 12,651 | 81.37% |
| TOTAL REGIONAL & QUALITY OF LIFE PROGRAM | | 3,562,214 | 929,925 | 2,967,902 | 0 | 7,460,041 | 5,476,510 | 1,983,531 | 73.41% |

SUBREGIONAL TRANS. PLANNING & PROGRAMMING

| TASK# | TASK DESCRIPTION | ORIGINAL BUDGET | BUDGET AMENDMENTS | ENCUMBRANCES | REVISED | TOTAL BUDGET | EXPEND. | BALANCE OF TASK | % EXPEND. |
|---|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|----------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| 0620200 | Transp. Modeling & Forecasting | 126,970 | 22,520 | 50,000 | 0 | 199,490 | 153,903 | 45,587 | 77.15% |
| 0620300 | Congestion Management | 261,682 | -38,381 | 11,712 | 0 | 235,013 | 180,508 | 54,505 | 76.81% |
| 0621300 | High Desert Corridor Study | 11,287 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11,287 | 8,491 | 2,796 | 75.23% |
| 0640900 | Data Development & Management | 202,063 | 34,688 | 0 | 0 | 236,751 | 165,896 | 70,855 | 70.07% |
| 0650000 | Trans. Improvement Program | 147,396 | 78,632 | 0 | 0 | 226,028 | 223,031 | 2,997 | 98.67% |
| 0652600 | Subregional Trans. Monitoring | 39,959 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39,959 | 13,425 | 26,534 | 33.60% |
| 0660105 | County Trans. Commission - GEN | 248,773 | 29,472 | 0 | 0 | 278,245 | 277,871 | 374 | 99.87% |
| 0660110 | Agency Strategic Planning | 442,473 | -42,612 | 0 | 0 | 399,861 | 148,524 | 251,337 | 37.14% |
| 0670100 | Valley Signal Coordination Program | 3,485,898 | 36,500 | 899,114 | 0 | 4,421,512 | 353,137 | 4,068,375 | 7.99% |
| 0694100 | Mountain/Desert Policies | 772,044 | 1,377,000 | 0 | 0 | 2,149,044 | 775,007 | 1,374,037 | 36.06% |
| TOTAL SUBREGIONAL TRANS. PLANNING & PROG | | 5,736,545 | 1,497,819 | 960,826 | 0 | 8,197,190 | 2,299,792 | 5,897,398 | 28.06% |

San Bernardino Associated Governments

Budget to Actual

PERIOD: July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006

FISCAL YEAR: July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

| TASK# | TASK DESCRIPTION | ORIGINAL BUDGET | BUDGET AMENDMENTS | ENCUMBRANCES | REVISED | TOTAL BUDGET | EXPEND. | BALANCE OF TASK | % EXPEND. |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| 0625200 | I-215 Corridor (S. of I-10) | 1,032,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,135,778 | 2,167,778 | 185,339 | 1,982,439 | 8.55% |
| 0625300 | I-215 Final Design (N. of I-10) | 4,288,000 | -128,394 | 0 | 18,034,179 | 22,195,785 | 5,063,765 | 17,132,020 | 22.81% |
| 0625800 | Rt. 71 Right of Way Acquisition | 650,000 | 0 | 0 | 62,531 | 712,531 | 20,847 | 691,684 | 2.93% |
| 0626800 | Rt. 30 Final Design | 125,000 | 834,914 | 0 | 326,485 | 1,286,399 | 151,229 | 1,135,170 | 11.76% |
| 0626900 | Rt. 30 Right of Way Acquisition | 155,000 | 0 | 0 | 451,032 | 606,032 | 189,488 | 416,544 | 31.27% |
| 0627200 | I-10/Tippecanoe Interchange Design | 254,000 | 0 | 0 | 300,000 | 554,000 | 125,889 | 428,111 | 22.72% |
| 0627300 | Rt. 71 Landscape Design & Const. | 200,000 | 100,000 | 0 | 582,332 | 882,332 | 598,465 | 283,867 | 67.83% |
| 0627500 | Grade Separation Projects | 0 | 5,800,000 | 0 | 786,983 | 6,586,983 | 2,002,253 | 4,584,730 | 30.40% |
| 0636800 | Rt. 30/210 Const. Sup. Traff. Mitgth | 81,670,000 | 386,000 | 0 | 72,939,313 | 154,995,313 | 71,193,113 | 83,802,200 | 45.93% |
| 0643000 | I-10 East Projects | 16,972,000 | 3,104,523 | 0 | 4,559,694 | 24,636,217 | 18,729,312 | 5,906,905 | 76.02% |
| 0651400 | Measure I Program Management | 5,008,996 | 95,016 | 0 | 7,579,470 | 12,683,482 | 4,260,805 | 8,422,677 | 33.59% |
| 0693100 | Debt Service - Major/97 Issue | 10,528,681 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,528,681 | 10,528,681 | 0 | 100.00% |
| 0694400 | Debt Service - Major/96 Issue | 5,821,813 | -154,109 | 0 | 0 | 5,667,704 | 5,667,704 | 0 | 100.00% |
| 0694800 | Debt Service - Major 01/02 Issue | 11,655,688 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 11,655,688 | 11,655,688 | 0 | 100.00% |
| 0694900 | Debt Service - Major 01/02 Issue | 2,146,578 | 7,957,171 | 0 | 0 | 10,103,749 | 10,103,749 | 0 | 100.00% |
| TOTAL PROJECT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM | | 140,507,756 | 17,997,120 | | 106,757,797 | 265,262,673 | 140,476,326 | 124,786,347 | 52.96% |

TRANSIT / COMMUTER RAIL PROGRAM

| TASK# | TASK DESCRIPTION | ORIGINAL BUDGET | BUDGET AMENDMENTS | ENCUMBRANCES | REVISED | TOTAL BUDGET | EXPEND. | BALANCE OF TASK | % EXPEND. |
|--|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| 0630905 | General Transit | 193,549 | 0 | 0 | 55,000 | 248,549 | 184,960 | 63,589 | 74.42% |
| 0630910 | OmniTrans | 70,959 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70,959 | 46,166 | 24,793 | 65.06% |
| 0630920 | Barstow-County Transit | 19,347 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19,347 | 6,754 | 12,593 | 34.91% |
| 0630930 | Victor Valley Transit | 38,142 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38,142 | 25,127 | 13,015 | 65.88% |
| 0630940 | Morongo Basin Transit | 23,085 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23,085 | 8,986 | 14,099 | 38.93% |
| 0630950 | Social Service Transportation Plan | 102,102 | 0 | 0 | 14,584 | 116,686 | 93,829 | 22,857 | 80.41% |
| 0630960 | Needles Transit | 11,698 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11,698 | 8,259 | 3,439 | 70.61% |
| 0630970 | Mountain Area Transit | 25,071 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25,071 | 17,282 | 7,789 | 68.93% |
| 0635205 | General Commuter Rail | 528,680 | 0 | 0 | 115,811 | 644,491 | 354,747 | 289,744 | 55.04% |
| 0635220 | Commuter Rail Operating Exp. | 7,118,000 | 0 | 0 | 68,266 | 7,186,266 | 6,451,695 | 734,571 | 89.78% |
| 0635225 | Speedway Rail Operating Exp. | 229,200 | 60,000 | 0 | 0 | 289,200 | 248,383 | 40,817 | 85.89% |
| 0635230 | Commuter Rail Capital Expenses | 3,746,000 | 1,777,875 | 0 | 3,746,802 | 9,270,677 | 3,151,292 | 6,119,385 | 33.99% |
| 0635260 | Redlands Rail Feasibility Study | 219,890 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 219,890 | 66,303 | 153,587 | 30.15% |
| 0635290 | Gold Line Phase II | 65,617 | 0 | 0 | 945,541 | 1,011,158 | 632,119 | 379,039 | 62.51% |
| TOTAL TRANSIT / COMMUTER RAIL PROGRAM | | 12,391,340 | 1,837,875 | | 4,946,004 | 19,175,219 | 11,235,903 | 7,879,316 | 58.91% |

San Bernardino Associated Governments

Budget to Actual

PERIOD: July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006

FISCAL YEAR: July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006

TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS & FUND ADMIN. PROGRAM

| TASK# | TASK DESCRIPTION | ORIGINAL BUDGET | BUDGET AMENDMENTS | ENCUMBRANCES | REVISED | TOTAL BUDGET | EXPEND. | BALANCE OF TASK | % EXPEND. |
|---|--|--------------------|----------------------|--------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| 0637300 | Federal/State Fund Administration | 434,922 | -38,345 | 0 | 18,414 | 414,991 | 366,584 | 48,407 | 88.34% |
| 0650100 | Federal/Transit Act Programming | 71,374 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71,374 | 31,879 | 39,495 | 44.66% |
| 0650200 | TDA Administration | 390,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 390,000 | 282,838 | 107,162 | 72.52% |
| 0650400 | Measure I Admin - Valley | 424,888 | 0 | 0 | 8,493 | 433,381 | 104,545 | 328,836 | 24.12% |
| 0650500 | Measure I Admin - Mt./Desert Gen. | 160,028 | 25,000 | 0 | 2,123 | 187,151 | 92,140 | 95,011 | 49.23% |
| 9180000 | Valley Measure I Local | 19,390,467 | 4,595,847 | 0 | 0 | 23,986,314 | 23,986,315 | 0 | 100.00% |
| 9180100 | Mountain/Desert Measure I Local | 19,614,463 | 4,413,438 | 0 | 0 | 24,027,901 | 24,027,900 | 0 | 100.00% |
| 0651300 | Measure I Valley E & H | 5,341,813 | 0 | 0 | 1,046,973 | 6,388,786 | 5,839,590 | 549,196 | 91.40% |
| 0690700 | Debt Service - Big Bear | 0 | 108,183 | 0 | 0 | 108,183 | 108,183 | 0 | 100.00% |
| 0690800 | Debt Service - Mt/Unincorp | 0 | 45,926 | 0 | 0 | 45,926 | 45,926 | 0 | 100.00% |
| 0694600 | Debt Service - Barstow/96 | 741,850 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 741,850 | 741,850 | 0 | 100.00% |
| 0695000 | Debt Service - Yucca Valley/01 Issue B | 35,347 | 131,029 | 0 | 0 | 166,376 | 166,376 | 0 | 100.00% |
| TOTAL TRANSP. PROGRAMS & FUND ADMIN. | | 46,605,152 | 9,281,078 | | 1,076,003 | 56,962,233 | 55,794,127 | 1,168,106 | 97.95% |

PROGRAM SUPPORT/COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS PROG.

| TASK# | TASK DESCRIPTION | ORIGINAL BUDGET | BUDGET AMENDMENTS | ENCUMBRANCES | REVISED | TOTAL BUDGET | EXPEND. | BALANCE OF TASK | % EXPEND. |
|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| 0610400 | Intergovernmental Relations | 538,935 | -62,446 | 0 | 0 | 476,489 | 374,669 | 101,820 | 78.63% |
| 0649000 | Council of Govts. New Initiatives | 223,411 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 223,411 | 0 | 223,411 | 0.00% |
| 0650300 | Legislation | 184,787 | 62,446 | 0 | 190,275 | 437,508 | 433,645 | 3,863 | 99.12% |
| 0660500 | Publications & Public Outreach | 514,757 | 0 | 0 | 2,998 | 517,755 | 487,674 | 30,081 | 94.19% |
| 0680500 | Building Operations | 550,000 | 179,000 | 0 | 0 | 729,000 | 222,472 | 506,528 | 30.52% |
| 0694200 | Financial Management | 398,296 | 0 | 0 | 59,374 | 457,670 | 359,593 | 98,077 | 78.57% |
| TOTAL PROGRAM SUPPORT/COUNCIL OF GOVMTS PROG. | | 2,410,186 | 179,000 | | 252,647 | 2,841,833 | 1,878,054 | 963,779 | 66.09% |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|--|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| GRAND TOTALS | | 211,215,193 | 31,722,817 | 116,961,179 | 359,899,189 | 217,220,712 | 142,678,477 | 60.36% |
|---------------------|--|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|

- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
- San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 5

Date: September 20, 2006

Subject: SANBAG Policy Defining Employee Service Hours

Recommendation:* Approve amendments to SANBAG Policy 10107, Compensation Administration, to update definition of service hours and make technical correction.

Background: In May 2006, the Board approved an amendment to Contract No. 05051 with the County of San Bernardino. This agreement provides for certain benefits for SANBAG employees administered by the County of San Bernardino, including both long- and short-term disability coverage. This item recommends amendments to SANBAG Policy 10107, which defines service hours, to address issues related to disability coverage.

Service hours are used in calculations for employee benefits and performance evaluations. The definition of service hours needs to address time covered by disability payments. The amendment to this policy references time covered by disability payments, which are not included as service hours for the purpose of determining benefits and performance evaluation periods.

An additional amendment is proposed to correct a technical error referencing probationary period rather than six months in position.

*

Approved
Administrative Committee

Date: _____

Moved: _____ *Second:* _____

In Favor: _____ *Opposed:* _____ *Abstained:* _____

Witnessed: _____

- Financial Impact:*** This item provides for clarity in calculating employee benefits and performance evaluation periods. It has minimal financial impact to the adopted 2006/2007 budget.
- Reviewed By:*** This item is scheduled for review by the Administrative Committee on September 20, 2006.
- Responsible Staff:*** Deborah Robinson Barmack
Director of Management Services

Attachment #1: ADM0609A1

| | | |
|--|--------------|--------------------|
| San Bernardino Associated Governments | Policy | 10107 |
| Adopted by the Board of Directors August 7, 1991 | Revised | 9/20/06 9/13/06 |
| Compensation Administration | Revision No. | 5 4 |

Table of Contents

[Purpose](#) | [References](#) | [Policy](#) | [Definitions](#) | [Salary Plan](#) | [Salary Ranges](#) | [Start Rates](#) | [Guidelines for Adjusting Individual Salaries](#) | [Reclassification](#) | [Review of Positions for Reorganization](#) | [Salary Range and Adjustments](#) | [Employee Recognition Program](#) | [Revision History](#)

IV. DEFINITIONS

Anniversary Date: An employee's original date of hire in a regular position is the anniversary date for computation of benefits. Refer to [Policy 10110](#) for definition of "regular".

Classification: Refer to [Policy 10110](#) for definition.

Evaluation Date: Date established to evaluate an employee's performance in a particular position. The evaluation date changes depending upon the start date in the position. Refer to [Policy 10115](#).

Position: A position is a post of employment assigned to a specific organizational unit and a specific supervisor.

Reclassification: The salary range, duties, and/or classification (refer to [Policy 10110](#) for definition/description of classification) are adjusted, either higher or lower as a result of an evaluation of duties and responsibilities.

Salary Range: The minimum and maximum of the salary for a particular classification or group of classifications. The range is based upon skills and responsibilities required for work performed in comparison with other work performed within the Agency and in comparison with the competitive labor market.

Service Hours: ~~Completed service hours are regularly scheduled hours in a paid status (including paid leave), up to 80 hours per pay period. Overtime hours and time without pay shall not count toward step advancements.~~

Service Hours – All hours in a paid status during an employee's regular tour of duty, up to 80 hours per pay period. Time without pay, disability payments, Medical Emergency Leave, and overtime hours do not count as service hours.

Step: Steps A through E of a salary range, usually at uniform increments. These steps apply to support and administrative/professional staff only.

Time-in-Position: The amount of time an employee has been in his/her present position.

Underfill: Employee appointed to a position at a lower classification/range (based on skill and experience level) than at the higher budget-approved classification/range.

XIII. REVISION HISTORY

| Revision No. | Description of Changes | Adopted |
|--------------|---|---------|
| 5 | Par. IV. DEFINITIONS: Revised definition for "service hours". | |

- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
■ San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 6

Date: September 20, 2006

Subject: Termination of Lease 06-011 with Manuel Ramos, dba: Apostle Café

Recommendation:* Approve the termination of Lease 06-011 with Manuel Ramos, dba: Apostle Café.

Background: In August 2005 the Board approved three leases for space within the San Bernardino Santa Fe Depot; one with Amtrak, one with the City of San Bernardino for a police substation and a third with Manuel Ramos, dba: Apostle Café. The Board also authorized a budget amendment that provided \$117,700 in Rail Asset revenue to assist with tenant improvements.

In December 2005 the Board approved an amendment to the budget, increasing the total amount available for tenant improvements to \$179,000. The increase was necessitated because of additional cost associated with connecting the heating and air conditioning with the existing system and space planning, preparation of construction document and construction management that were not include in the earlier estimate. Tenant improvements for the police substation have been completed and it is estimated that approximately \$30,000 remains available for tenant improvements for the proposed coffee shop area.

Space plans and construction documents were developed for both the police substation and Apostle Café. The plans for the Apostle Café have not been approved and are being held by the Health Department pending information from the future tenant. The future tenant has not been responsive to the Health Department's request for information. On August 2, 2006, a letter from CityCom

*

Approved
Administrative Committee

Date: _____

Moved:

Second:

In Favor:

Opposed:

Abstained:

Witnessed: _____

Real Estate Services, our property management firm, was sent to Mr. Ramos giving notice that unless measurable progress was demonstrated by the 15th, consideration would be given to terminating the lease. No progress has been reported. Therefore, staff is recommending that the Board terminate Lease 06-011 effective October 4, 2006.

Financial Impact: Since the commencement of the lease is conditioned on the substantial completion of tenant improvements which has not occurred, there is no loss of lease revenue. Termination of the lease will allow the property manager to begin marketing the space for tenancy.

Reviewed By: This item will be reviewed by the Administrative Committee on September 20, 2006.

Responsible Staff: Michael Bair, Director of Transit and Rail Programs

- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
- San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 7

Date: September 20, 2006

Subject: Proposed New Local Streets Financing Program

Recommendation:* Recommend approval of the concept of the program and direct staff to further investigate implementation of the program.

Background: The City of Colton and Agency staff have had discussions over the past four months regarding the City's desire to use new Measure I sales tax revenue designated for Local Streets (Exhibit A, Section F of the San Bernardino Valley Subarea Expenditure Plan) as security for a loan from the State of California Infrastructure Bank. An \$8 million loan to the City from the Infrastructure Bank would be used for major resurfacing and reconstruction of the local streets in the City that are in the most need for major repair.

Staff has had discussions with Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP, the Agency's bond counsel, on financing issues related to the new Measure I. A result of those discussions was the attached letter dated August 25, 2006 regarding Measure I: Local Streets, which outlined the legal impediments to the use of Measure I sales tax revenues by a city to secure debt to finance local road improvements.

Staff met with City of Colton representatives on August 30, 2006 to discuss a conceptual program that may assist cities in the use of current and new Measure I

Approved
Administrative Committee

Date: _____

Moved: _____ *Second:* _____

In Favor: _____ *Opposed:* _____ *Abstained:* _____

Witnessed: _____

to secure financing of capital improvements for local streets. The proposed concept of a Local Streets Financing Program includes:

1. SANBAG (as the "Transportation Authority") must be determined to be a permitted or eligible borrower either by statute and/or under the terms of the lending program of the Infrastructure Bank.
2. If approved as a borrower, SANBAG would borrow directly from the Infrastructure Bank and provide funding for the capital projects to the sponsoring City under a funding agreement that would define the amounts and terms of the withholdings from current and/or future Measure I distributions to the City.
3. SANBAG would secure the borrowing from the Infrastructure Bank with a pledge of Measure I funds that is **subordinate to existing first lien debt of the current Measure I and all future first lien debt of the new Measure I**. It may be possible to have this program overlap the two measures.
4. The Infrastructure Bank program has limited funds available for this type of program, and therefore it may not be available if other cities seek similar loans. However, this program should be structured and only approved if it accommodates other subordinate lien debt issued on a parity basis by the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority.
5. While the senior/first lien bond financing program for the New Measure I will be primarily used for Major Projects (Freeways and Interchanges), there may be some New Measure I financing requirements for Passenger Rail and Major Arterials. Future Board policy will have to address whether Passenger Rail and Major Arterial financing requirements should be funded within the senior or subordinate debt financing program.

Financial Impact:

This Program requires careful policy consideration since the purpose is to develop a financing program that benefits local Measure I participants while not impacting the overall financing program for larger capital projects. It also raises issues related to debt funding of Local Streets projects verses "pay-as-you-go" funding. Further investigation of the Program will require additional consultant time from the Agency's Financial Advisor and Bond Counsel, as well as Agency Counsel. While there is no immediate impact to the FY 2006/2007 Budget, work on this program and possibly other financing requirements could require budget and contract amendments before the end of the fiscal year.

Admin. Agenda Item
September 20, 2006
Page 3

Reviewed By: This item is scheduled for review by the Administrative Committee on September 20, 2006.

Responsible Staff: Terrence J. McGuire, Chief Financial Officer

ADM0609b-tjm.doc
94207000
Attachments
ADM0609b1-tjm.doc



ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFF LLP
THE ORRICK BUILDING
405 HOWARD STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-1559
(415) 773-5700
fax (415) 773-5759
WWW.ORRICK.COM

AUG 28 2006

August 25, 2006

Roger L. Davis
(415) 773-5758
rogerdavis@orrick.com

Terry McGuire
Chief Financial Officer
San Bernardino Associated Governments
1170 W. 3rd Street, 2nd Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92410-1715

Re: Measure I: Local Streets

Dear Terry:

You have asked for our thoughts on the ability of a city in the San Bernardino Valley Subarea to borrow money against Measure I sales tax revenues for Local Street Projects.

1. To begin with, there is no statutory authority for a city to borrow money for such purposes.
2. Even if there were such statutory authority, Article XVI, Section 18 of the State Constitution prohibits cities from borrowing money without a two-thirds vote of the electorate.
3. There are several judicially created exceptions to this Constitutional debt restriction.
4. The exception that might appear to be most relevant is the revenue bond exception, but that exception requires a nexus between the source of revenue and the use of bond proceeds (for example, revenues of a water system and bonds the proceeds of which are used to finance water facilities that are part of the system). Such nexus does not exist between sales taxes and local streets.
5. An exception that might apply is the lease exception. The city could lease property to a separate entity of some kind and lease it back. The separate entity would assign its rights in the lease-back to a trustee that would issue certificates of participation (COPs) in the right to receive lease rentals. (If the separate entity is a joint powers authority, it can issue bonds instead of COPs). The proceeds could be used for Local Street Projects. The city's obligation to make lease rental payments would be a general fund obligation, but could be serviced by sales tax revenues to the extent received by the city.



Terry McGuire
August 25, 2006
Page 2

6. In order to use the lease exception, the following additional considerations would apply:
 - (a) The city would have to have unencumbered property which it is willing and able to encumber by lease (for 15 to 30 years) with a value at least equal to the principal amount of the COPs or bonds.
 - (b) The city would have to obligate its general fund, because it cannot pledge the Measure I sales taxes or limit its exposure to the Measure I sales tax, although it can get close to the same effect by limiting the amount of the semiannual lease rental obligation to the lesser of the fixed rent needed to amortize the obligation or the amount of sales taxes received during the preceding rental period.
 - (c) Additional costs would be incurred for title insurance, rental interruption insurance and the like.
 - (d) The sales tax allocation to the city under the Measure I Expenditure Plan has some unusual elements of uncertainty, being (i) subject to changes due not only to volatility in Measure I sales tax collections generally, (ii) but also due to annual changes in relative population among local jurisdictions, and (iii) conditioned on the receipt of the annually adopted Five Year Plan (which must be consistent with local, regional and state transportation plans) and (iv) that receipt of sales taxes by the local jurisdiction may be subordinate to pledge(s) of sales taxes by the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority to secure bonds issued by the Authority pursuant to Section X of the Measure I Ordinance.

As a further observation, I would note that issuance of any kind of obligations by local jurisdictions predicated on the Measure I sales taxes could create market confusion with respect to Measure I sales tax backed obligations issued by the Authority, possibly to the detriment of both.



Terry McGuire
August 25, 2006
Page 3

Please let me know if you have any questions about the foregoing or if you would like any additional information.

Sincerely,

Roger L. Davis

RLD/jkm

- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
■ San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 8

Date: September 20, 2006

Subject: Request for Proposal for SANBAG Federal Advocacy Services

Recommendation:* Approve the release of a Request for Proposals (RFP): for federal advocacy services (RFP C07075) to be provided from January 2007 through December 2008. Also, authorize the SANBAG Director of Intergovernmental and Legislative Affairs to solicit for members of the selection committee.

Background: In the fall of 2002, staff negotiated a two-year contract with two, two-year options commencing January 1, 2003 for federal advocacy services. The contract was shared with Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC).

In September 2004, the board approved the first option for a two-year amendment to the contract (03-008-1), with a contract end date of December 31, 2006. The main purpose for extending the contract at that time was to assure consistency of federal representation through the negotiation process for the Federal Transportation Reauthorization Act. As with the original contract, the amended contract was established jointly with the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), with 50 percent of the cost for the contract being reimbursed to SANBAG by RCTC.

Noting the near end-date of the joint contract for federal advocacy services, RCTC has decided to seek a separate contract for federal advocacy services. Therefore, RCTC is completing a separate RFP process and will no longer share 50 percent for the cost of the contract for federal advocacy services. This change

Approved
Administrative Committee

Date: _____

Moved: _____ *Second:* _____

In Favor: _____ *Opposed:* _____ *Abstained:* _____

Witnessed: _____

mirrors RCTC's decision to also seek a separate contract for state advocacy services.

Subject to approval by the SANBAG board, staff suggests the following procedure:

SANBAG staff will organize a selection committee composed of government affairs staff from Southern California transportation agencies, the SANBAG Executive Director, SANBAG Director of Intergovernmental and Legislative Affairs and one additional SANBAG Director if deemed necessary. The ad hoc review committee will be forwarded proposals for review during the week of November 6, 2006. SANBAG may conduct interviews with some or all of the proposing firms tentatively to be held during the week of November 27, 2006. Those participating in the ad hoc review committee must be available for both the review of RFP's and the interviews of potential firms that submitted an RFP. The selected firms will be approved by the SANBAG governing body.

To coincide with the federal legislative schedules this contract would be for two, two-year Congressional and State Legislative Sessions with an option to extend the contract, one additional two-year session by action of the governing board.

- Financial Impact:*** SANBAG has budgeted for federal advocacy services contracts in the 2006-2007 Fiscal Year Budget.
- Reviewed By:*** This item is scheduled for review by the Administrative Committee on September 20, 2006.
- Responsible Staff:*** Jennifer Franco, Director of Intergovernmental and Legislative Affairs

SAN BERNARDINO ASSOCIATED GOVERNMENTS

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS RFPC07075 FEDERAL ADVOCACY SERVICES

Proposals Due: 3:00 p.m., November 6, 2006

SANBAG FEDERAL ADVOCACY SERVICES

INTRODUCTION

The San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) is a Council of Governments and a county transportation planning agency, governed by the mayors of twenty-four cities and the five members of the Board of Supervisors within San Bernardino County.

Currently, SANBAG holds a joint contract with Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) for federal advocacy services, which expires on December 31, 2006. At this time, SANBAG and RCTC are seeking separate Requests for Proposals to better serve each agency's needs.

This Request for Proposal (RFP) describes SANBAG's needs for federal advocacy services. It is organized into the following sections:

- 1.0 Background
- 2.0 Proposed RFP Schedule
- 3.0 Examination of RFP Documents
- 4.0 Interpretation of RFP Documents
- 5.0 Notice of Intent and Q&A Process
- 6.0 Scope of Work
- 7.0 Components of Proposed RFP
- 8.0 Submittal of Proposals
- 9.0 Modification and Alternative Proposals
- 10.0 Signing of Proposal/Authorization to Negotiate
- 11.0 Withdrawal of Proposals
- 12.0 Evaluation Criteria
- 13.0 Evaluation Process
- 14.0 SANBAG Rights
- 15.0 Protests
- Attachment A – Draft Contract

1.0 BACKGROUND

SANBAG provides short- and long-term planning services relating to transportation, air quality, congestion management, and freeway call boxes. In the future, SANBAG will be expanding its Council of Government role to extend to regional issues, not necessarily associated with transportation. With regards to funding, SANBAG allocates Local Transportation Funds and the Federal Transit Assistance funds provided for support of public transit and local streets. SANBAG is also responsible for the administration of San Bernardino County Measure I, the voter-approved half cent transportation transactions and use taxes which will have generated approximately 1.6 billion dollars

through the year 2009 for funding major freeway construction, commuter rail services, local street and road improvements, specialized transit service for the elderly and persons with disabilities population and traffic management and environmental enhancement efforts.

SANBAG will make every effort to administer the proposal process in accordance with terms and dates outlined in this RFP; however, reserves the right to modify the activities, timeline and any other aspect of the process at any time it is deemed necessary. By requesting proposals SANBAG is in no way obligated to award a contract or pay the expenses of proposing firms in connection with the preparation or submission of a proposal.

The awarding of a contract shall be contingent upon the availability of funds and staff and board approvals. The decision to award any contract to a particular firm shall be based on the criteria listed in this RFP and any other pertinent factors that may come to the attention of the evaluators. No single factor will determine the final award decision.

2.0 PROPOSED RFP SCHEDULE

| Action Item | Deadline |
|---|--|
| Release of Request for Proposal | October 4, 2006 |
| Amendments to RFP (if any) emailed to Prospective Proposers | October 20, 2006 |
| Proposals Due to SANBAG Cost Proposals to be mailed separately | November 6, 2006, no later than 3:00 p.m. |
| Proposer Interviews | Week of November 27, 2006 |
| Recommend Contract Award to SANBAG Administrative Committee | December 13, 2006 |
| SANBAG Board Award of Contract | January 3, 2007 |
| Notice to Proceed | January 3, 2007 |

3.0 EXAMINATION OF RFP DOCUMENTS

The Proposer shall be solely responsible for examining, with appropriate care, the RFP documents, including any Addenda issued during the proposal period, and for informing itself with respect to any and all conditions which may in any way affect the amount or nature of proposal, or the performance of the work in the event Proposer is selected. Failure of the Proposer to so examine and inform itself shall be at its sole risk and no relief for error or omission will be given.

4.0 INTERPRETATION OF RFP DOCUMENTS

The Proposer may request of SANBAG in writing, prior to submission of proposal, clarification or interpretation of the RFP documents as described in Section 4.0. Where

such interpretation or clarification requires a change in the RFP documents, SANBAG will issue an Addendum. Proposer shall acknowledge receipt of any and all Addenda in its Proposal Letter. SANBAG shall not be bound by and Proposer shall not rely on any oral interpretation or clarification of the RFP documents.

5.0 NOTICE OF INTENT AND Q&A PROCESS

- a. The Proposer shall submit a notice of intent that an RFP will be submitted by the given deadline. Notices of Intent shall be submitted in writing by October 13, 2006, no later than 3:00 p.m.
- b. The name of your firm, the primary contact, your phone, fax and email are required in this correspondence. If you do not submit this information and your intention to SANBAG by the deadline, you will not receive any further updates and your proposal will not be accepted.
- c. The notice of intent does not hold Proposers to submit an RFP.
- d. Questions or clarifications on the RFP may be submitted in writing until 3:00 p.m. on October 13, 2006. Proposer questions received by SANBAG after 3:00 p.m. on October 13, 2006 WILL NOT be acknowledged or answered.
- e. By October 17, 2006, responses, if any, to submitted written questions will be made in writing and distributed via email to those Proposers who submitted in writing to SANBAG that they intended to submit a proposal.
- f. Responses to the requests for clarifications and or any amendments to the RFP shall be emailed to the Prospective Proposers (who submitted their names to SANBAG in writing by October 13, 2006) by 3:00 pm on October 17, 2006.
- g. Questions regarding the content, intent or procedural matters of this RFP should be addressed to:

Jennifer Franco
Director of Intergovernmental and Legislative Affairs
San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG)
1170 W. 3rd Street, 2nd Floor. San Bernardino, CA 92401-1421
Phone: 909.884.8276 X 121 FAX: 909.885.4407
E-mail jfranco@sanbag.ca.gov

Please note: Except for Jennifer Franco, potential Proposers should **NOT** contact SANBAG Board Members, SANBAG Board Member's staff, and/or SANBAG staff, regarding any aspect of this RFP. It is intended that the selection of a Firm shall be made on merit alone, based on the processes and criteria set forth in the RFP. Violation

of this condition shall, at SANBAG's sole discretion, be cause for immediate disqualification of a Proposer's proposal.

6.0 SCOPE OF WORK

6.1 *Overall Goal*

Successfully achieve the intended results of the San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) Federal Legislative Program. Continue to establish and maintain positive working relationships with the San Bernardino County Congressional delegation and administration staff. To best assure continuity of service, SANBAG seeks a four year contract with a provision for a one-time two year extension.

6.2 *Required Tasks/Activities*

Tasks will include, but not be limited to the following:

- a. Seek out and identify legislation and/or amendments to legislation that coincide with the SANBAG Legislative Work Program.
- b. Routinely communicate with delegation members, and members of related House and Senate Committees on legislation sponsored by SANBAG and Congressional positions adopted in response to specific legislative or budget proposals. This may occur through both written and oral communication.
- c. Provide information, copies of introduced legislation, relevant testimony and any analysis of legislation relative to SANBAG.
- d. Coordination of advocacy efforts that may include testimony by the selected firm's representatives, and/or SANBAG Board member and/or staff.
- e. Advise and assist SANBAG in developing strategy on legislation, regulations and actions contemplated at any government level.
- f. Forward newspaper clippings, copies of e-newsletters and/or magazine articles pertaining to the political climate, political issues or legislative issues as deemed necessary and that are pertinent to SANBAG's Legislative Work Program.
- g. Assist with the development, attendance, and programming of a Legislative Staff Tour/Luncheon for delegation member staff and other events as necessary.
- h. Provide a written monthly update to the SANBAG Board of Directors which summarizes the firm's most recent efforts on behalf of SANBAG, including but not limited to: testimony before committee, individual meetings with Congressional members and written correspondence on behalf of SANBAG. This report shall also

contain any relevant information regarding Congressional activities/progress on moving legislation, adopting a budget, and general activities or action of Federal government that could impact SANBAG's interests.

- i. Provide an annual end-of-year report to summarize activities throughout the year, accomplishments and ideas for further consideration.
- j. Attend at least one regular board meeting per year to report on Congressional activities. Additional requests may be made by SANBAG as necessary. Visits to SANBAG shall be compensated as outlined in the contract.
- k. Assist with other activities as requested.

7.0 COMPONENTS OF A PROPOSED RFP

Proposals shall be comprised of the following:

- a. General Guidance – Proposals shall be prepared on bound 8-1/2" x 11" paper, stapled, double-sided with no color (black print only). Proposals should not exceed fifty (50) pages in length, excluding any appendices.
- b. Proposal Transmittal Letter – Not to exceed two pages and identifying the individual responsible for committing the firm.
- c. Proposed Scope of Work in Response to the RFP – Scope shall address the firm's understanding of the work to be performed, including identification of specific tasks, timelines and work effort (personnel hours by task). Proposing firms are encouraged to identify opportunities to perform the work in the most cost effective manner.
- d. Qualifications of the Firm(s) – Experience of the firm in conducting similar type studies within the past five years. This section should be limited to no more than 15 pages. If subcontractors are to be used, provide brief statements of similar type work performed within the past five years.
- e. Qualifications of Proposed Staff – Include a brief resume of proposed staff accompanied with the identification of similar work the proposed staff has participated in within the past five years. The same information should be provided for any subcontractors.
- f. Project Management – Provide an explanation of the project management system and practices used to assure that the project is completed within the scheduled timeframe and that the quality of the products will meet SANBAG's requirements.
- g. References – Provide at least three references for whom the firms have provided similar work within the past five years. Client contact person name, with address and

telephone number are to be provided. References for subcontractors shall also be provided.

- h. Cost Proposal – Proposing firms are to prepare a cost proposal that includes a breakdown of expenses by proposed task. The cost proposal shall include all items that will be charged to SANBAG, including travel and other direct charges that will be involved in the project. Costs shall be segregated to show staff hours, rates and classification and administrative overhead. Cost information shall be totaled to show the cost breakdown per contract year.

Cost proposals must be submitted in a separate sealed envelope no later than **3:00 p.m. PDT on Monday, November 6, 2006.**

8.0 SUBMITTAL OF PROPOSALS

Interested firms may submit a proposal for federal advocacy services. Proposing firms are to submit one original and four (4) copies of their proposal by 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, November 6, 2006. Proposals shall be addressed as follows:

San Bernardino Associated Governments
Attn: Jennifer Franco, Director of Intergovernmental and Legislative Affairs
1170 W. 3rd Street, 2nd Floor
San Bernardino, CA. 92410-1715

(909) 884-8276

9.0 MODIFICATION AND ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS

Proposer shall submit a proposal in strict conformity with the requirements of the RFP documents. The proposal shall be complete in itself and shall be submitted within a sealed enclosure in accordance with Section 8.0 instruction herein.

Unauthorized conditions, limitations or provisions attached to a proposal may render it invalid and cause its rejection. Alternative proposals will not be considered unless specifically requested. Oral, telegraphic or telephonic proposals or modifications will not be considered.

10.0 SIGNING OF PROPOSAL/AUTHORIZATION TO NEGOTIATE

Each proposal submitted by Proposer shall be executed by Proposer or by its authorized representative. In addition, Proposer must identify in Attachment "A", Proposal Letter, those persons authorized to negotiate on its behalf with SANBAG in connection with this RFP.

11.0 WITHDRAWAL OF PROPOSALS

A proposal may be withdrawn by the Proposer by means of a written request signed by the Proposer or its properly authorized representative. Such written requests must be delivered to SANBAG's office prior to the date and time for submittal of proposals.

12.0 EVALUATION CRITERIA

- a. The primary basis for evaluation will be the qualification of the firm and the firm's understanding of the work required based on the Scope of Services described in this RFP.
- b. To assist in the evaluators' understanding of the firm's qualifications and understanding of the work performed, proposers are requested to respond to the following:
 1. List all Federal legislators in general as well as those on key transportation, housing, environmental quality and regional planning related committees with whom your firm has worked closely in the past two (2) years;
 2. List all clients you presently represent on transportation, housing, regional environmental quality and/or regional planning matters, and for each indicate whether or not you feel there could be a conflict of interest;
 3. Describe your firm's familiarity with transportation finance, transportation planning, transit, commuter rail and other areas of SANBAG interest;
 4. Describe the resources (staff and other means) your firm has to perform the scope of services;
 5. Describe how your firm would approach the scope of services described in this RFP;
 6. List any political affiliations or professional associations the firm has.
 7. Describe the relevant education and experience of key staff to be assigned to this contract;
 8. Outline the availability of each key staff, in approximate hours per month, to work on SANBAG;
 9. For each key staff to be assigned to SANBAG work, please list three client references with their telephone numbers.

- c. Proposals will be reviewed by a staff evaluation committee composed of the SANBAG Executive Director, the SANBAG Director of Intergovernmental and Legislative Affairs and legislative affairs staff from transportation entities in the region. The charge of the selection committee will be to review every proposal, based on the criteria described in this RFP. Following its evaluation, the committee shall develop a short-list (2-4) firms for review and development of a final recommendation.
- d. Members of the selection committee will be coordinated by the SANBAG Director of Intergovernmental and Legislative Affairs. The SANBAG Director of Intergovernmental and Legislative Affairs will participate in deliberations, but not vote. The recommendation resulting from the selection committee's review of received proposals shall be considered by the SANBAG boards for ultimate approval or rejection.

13.0 EVALUATION PROCESS

13.1 Scoring

The evaluation scoring will be based on (1) qualification of the firm; (2) work program; (3) cost; and (4) past experience.

- a. Qualifications of the Firm
Technical experience in performing work of a closely similar nature; experience working with public agencies; strength and stability of the firm; review of client references and their experiences.
- b. Staffing and Project Organization
Qualifications of project staff, particularly key personnel; key personnel's level of involvement in performing related work cited in "Qualifications of the Firm" section; logic of project organization; adequacy of labor commitment; concurrence in the restrictions on changes in key personnel.
- c. Work Plan
Depth of Proposer's understanding of SANBAG's requirements and overall quality of work plan; logic, clarity and specificity of work plan; appropriateness of labor distribution among the tasks; ability to meet the implementation schedule; ability to meet the beat start time, as well as providing spare vehicles within the required timeframe; utility of suggested technical or procedural innovations.
- d. Cost and Price
Reasonableness of the total price and competitiveness of this amount with other proposals received; adequacy of data in support of figures quoted; basis on which prices are quoted.

- e. Completeness of Response
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions; exceptions to or deviations from the RFP requirements that the SANBAG cannot or will not accommodate; other relevant factors not considered elsewhere.

13.2 RFP Review

The selection committee will review proposals received in accordance with the above criteria. The evaluators in applying the major criteria to the proposals may consider additional sub-criteria beyond those listed. During the evaluation period, SANBAG may conduct interviews with some or all of the proposing firms. Interviews are tentatively scheduled for the week of November 27, 2006 at the SANBAG offices.

13.3 Award

The selection committee will review the proposals received and will submit, with approval of a SANBAG Policy Committee, the proposal considered to be the most competitive to SANBAG's Board for consideration and selection. The selection committee may also negotiate contract terms with the selected Proposer prior to award, and expressly reserves the right to negotiate with several Proposers simultaneously and, thereafter, to award a contract that best meets the needs of SANBAG.

Negotiations may or may not be conducted with Proposers; therefore, the proposal submitted should contain Proposer's most favorable terms and conditions, since the selection and award may be made without discussion with any Proposer.

13.4 Notifications of Award and Debriefing

Proposers who submit a proposal in response to this RFP shall be notified in writing regarding the firm who was awarded the contract. Such notification shall be made within ten (10) days of the date the contract is awarded by the SANBAG board of directors.

13.5 Basis of Award

Any contract resulting from this RFP will be awarded based upon demonstrated competence and on the professional qualifications and capabilities necessary for the performance of services required at a fair and reasonable price to SANBAG.

13.6 Type of Contract to Award

SANBAG intends to award a Fixed Price contract. Under no circumstances will the Not-to-Exceed price be exceeded without the express written consent of SANBAG. The contract will be for four years of service and may include a two-year option at its conclusion.

14.0 SANBAG RIGHTS

SANBAG may investigate the qualifications of any Proposer under consideration, require confirmation of information furnished by a Proposer, and require additional evidence of qualifications to perform the Scope of Services described in this RFP. SANBAG reserves the right to:

1. Reject any or all of the proposals for any reason.
2. Issue subsequent Requests for Proposals.
3. Cancel the entire Request for Proposal.
4. Remedy or overlook technical errors in the Request for Proposal process.
5. Create a selection committee to review proposals.
6. Seek the assistance of outside technical experts in proposal evaluation.
7. Approve or disapprove the use of particular subcontractors.
8. Establish a short list of Proposers eligible for discussions after review of written proposals.
9. Negotiate with any, all, or none of the respondents to the RFP.
10. Solicit best and final offers from all or some of the Proposers.
11. Award a contract to one or more Proposers.
12. Accept other than the lowest monetary offer.

13. Waive informalities and minor irregularities in proposals.

This RFP does not commit SANBAG to enter into a contract, nor does it obligate SANBAG to pay for any costs incurred in preparation and submission of proposals or in anticipation of a contract.

16.0 PROTESTS

Proposers may protest the recommended award made by SANBAG, provided the protest is in writing, contains the title of the RFP, is delivered to SANBAG, and is submitted within ten (10) calendar days of the date on the notification of intent to award by the SANBAG Board of Directors. Grounds for a protest are that SANBAG failed to follow the selection procedures and adhered to requirements specified in the RFP or any addenda or amendments; there has been a violation of conflict of interest as provided by California Government Code Section 87100 et seq.; or there has been a violation of State or Federal law. Protests will not be accepted on any other grounds. In event of a protest, all protests will be handled by a panel designated by the SANBAG Executive Director, or his/her designee.

SANBAG will consider only those specific issues addressed in the written protest. A written response by SANBAG will be directed to the protesting Proposer within fourteen (14) calendar days of receipt of the protest, advising of the decision with regard to the protest and the basis for the decision.

- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
■ San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 9

Date: September 20, 2006

Subject: 2006 November Ballot Initiatives

Recommendation:* Adopt the recommended positions for the following statewide initiatives, which have qualified for the 2006 November General Election ballot:

1. Support Proposition 1A (Proposition 42 fix) and Proposition 1B (infrastructure bond for transportation)
2. No Position on the following Propositions:
 - Propositions 1C (infrastructure bond for housing/emergency shelters);
 - Proposition 1D (infrastructure bond for schools);
 - Proposition 1E (infrastructure bond for flood prevention);
 - Proposition 84 (bonds for assuring water quality, water supply, flood control and natural resources and parks); and
 - Proposition 87 (tax on California oil to encourage alternative energy)
3. Oppose Proposition 90 (eminent domain)

Background: The information provided below is intended to assist the board formalize its position on initiatives that have qualified for the November 7, 2006 General Election ballot.

With regards to Propositions 1A-1E, earlier the state Legislature acted in a bipartisan manner to adopt an infrastructure bond investment program amounting

Approved
Administrative Committee

Date: _____

Moved: _____ *Second:* _____

In Favor: _____ *Opposed:* _____ *Abstained:* _____

Witnessed: _____

to more than \$37 billion. If approved by voters, the bond package will assist the state to fund infrastructure projects currently needed.

- ***Proposition 1A (SCA 7) – Proposition 42 Fix***
Staff Recommendation: Support

Proposition 1A would authorize a suspension, in whole or in part, of the transfer of revenues to the Transportation Investment Fund (TIF) for a fiscal year if (1) the Governor issues a proclamation that the suspension is necessary due to a severe state fiscal hardship; (2) a statute containing no other unrelated provision is enacted by a 2/3 vote of each house of the Legislature suspending the transfer; and (3) a statute is enacted to repay, with interest, the TIF within three years for the amount of any revenue that was not transferred as a result of the suspension. Treating suspensions as loans to the state's General Fund, the measure only allows suspension to occur twice in ten consecutive fiscal years. Should Proposition 1A be approved by the voters, no future suspension Proposition 42 could occur until prior suspensions (excluding those made prior to 2007-08) have been repaid in full.

Additionally, the measure lays out a new schedule to repay the Proposition 42 suspensions that occurred in 2003-04 and 2004-05. Specifically, the suspended amounts must be repaid and dedicated to transportation uses no later than June 20, 2016 at the specified minimum annual rate of repayment.

For the San Bernardino County region, the impact of Proposition 1A passing will improve reliability of funding for transportation since it will be more difficult for the Legislature to suspend Proposition 42.

Supporters of Proposition 1A include California League of Cities and California State Association of Counties. No opponents were found on record.

- ***Proposition 1B (SB 1266) - Transportation, Air Quality and Port Security***
Staff Recommendation: Support

Since 1990, voters have approved roughly \$5 billion in state general obligation bonds to fund transportation. These bond proceeds have been dedicated primarily to passenger rail and transit improvements, as well as to retrofit highways and bridges for earthquake safety. As of June 2006, all but about \$355 million of the authorized bonds have been spent on projects.

Proposition 1B would provide \$19.925 billion in general obligation bond proceeds for transportation, transit, air quality, goods movement and related infrastructure projects. Additionally, the measure would establish a new fund in the state treasury called the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Fund of 2006; establish application procedures and the criteria and qualifications for allocating and receiving bond money; and require legislative appropriations.

Proposition 1B would provide funding and set requirements for 12 programs as follows:

1. Corridor Mobility Improvement Program (\$4.5 billion): Allocated by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) upon appropriation by the Legislature for performance improvements on highly congested travel corridors, both state highways and major local access routes.

The allocation program must be geographically balanced, conform with the existing statutory 60%-40% funding split between the southern and northern county groups, and provide mobility improvements in highly-traveled or highly-congested corridors in all regions of the state.

2. State Route 99 Improvements (\$1 billion)
3. Port Infrastructure, Security and Air Quality (\$3.1 billion): Divided into three sub-programs:
 - o \$ 2 billion for trade corridor improvements
 - o \$1 billion to the Air Resources Board
 - o \$100,000,000 upon appropriation to the Office of Emergency
4. School bus Retrofit and Replacement (\$200,000,000)
5. State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) (\$2 billion)
6. Public Transit (\$4 billion)
7. State-Local Partnership Program (\$1 billion): Requires a one-for-one local funding match.
8. Transit System Security (\$1 billion)

9. Local Bridge Seismic Retrofit (\$125,000,000): Upon appropriation to provide the local 11.5 % matching funds required for federal Highway Bridge Replacement and Repair funds for seismic work on local bridges, ramps and overpasses. Caltrans would identify the projects.
10. Grade Separation and Railroad Crossing Safety (\$250,000,000): Upon appropriation to Caltrans for highway-railroad grade separation projects and railroad crossing safety improvements, allocated under the existing grade separation program and its priority list. Requires a one-for-one nonstate funding match and suspends the current funding cap for individual projects. Exempts \$100,000,000 of the total from the existing project criteria and process, however, for allocation by the CTC to railroad crossing improvements and grade separation projects not on the state list. Requires consultation with Caltrans and the Public Utilities Commission and consultation and coordination with the High Speed Rail Authority.
11. Highway Safety and Rehabilitation (\$750,000,000): Upon legislative appropriation to Caltrans and allocation by the CTC for the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP). Caltrans must develop a program for using \$250,000,000 of the total for traffic light synchronization or other technology improvements to increase the safety, operations and capacity of local streets and roads.
12. Local Street and Road Improvements (\$2 billion): Provides \$1 billion each to cities and counties upon legislative appropriation and allocation by the Controller according to specified formulas based on population, vehicle registration and maintained highway miles. Funds to be used for reducing local traffic congestion and increasing road safety, including maintenance, rehabilitation and construction, or local match for state or federal transportation funds.

For the San Bernardino County region, the impact of Proposition 1B passing will allow projects programmed in the 2006 STIP to continue. Without the additional funding to the STIP, current programmed projects would be in jeopardy. Additional projects in the San Bernardino region may be possible depending on the criteria and project selection process developed by CTC.

Supporter of Proposition 1B include California League of Cities and California State Association of Counties. An opponent to this measure is the Calif. Taxpayer Protection Committee.

• ***Proposition 1C (SB 1689) - Housing and Emergency Shelter***
Staff Recommendation: No Position

This measure authorizes the state to sell \$2.85 billion of general obligation bonds to fund 13 new and existing housing and development programs, including the following:

- Development Programs (\$1.35 billion)
- Homeownership Programs (\$625 million)
- Multifamily Housing Programs (\$590 million)
- Other Housing Programs (\$285 million)

More than 360,000 Californians are homeless and domestic violence shelters were unable to accommodate 5,000 women and children needing shelter last year.

A bond measure approved by voters in 2002 has been completely used to create more than 9,300 shelter spaces, 16,000 modest first homes for low-income families and 11,000 apartments for seniors and people with disabilities. No further bond money is available to create new homes and shelters.

Supporters of Proposition 1C include California League of Cities, California State Association of Counties and the San Diego Association of Governments. An opponent to this measure is the Calif. Taxpayer Protection Committee.

• ***Proposition 1D (AB 127) - K-12/University Facilities***
Staff Recommendation: No Position

Prop. 1D provides \$10.4 billion to reduce overcrowding, update schools for technology and career education and build college labs. Specifically, Proposition 1D aims to provide funding achieve the following objectives:

- Building improvements to increase fire prevention and earthquake safety on high school campuses throughout the state
- High school science, career and technical facilities and programs.
- Constructing nearly 10,000 new classrooms at schools and colleges and renovating 31,000 additional classrooms
- New schools development, such as charter schools and small high schools
- Update colleges and universities laboratories and facilities.

Supporters of Proposition 1D include California League of Cities and California State Association of Counties. An opponent to this measure is the Calif. Taxpayer Protection Committee.

- ***Proposition 1E (AB 140) - Flood Prevention***

Staff Recommendation: No Position

Proposition 1E authorizes the state to sell about \$4.1 billion in general obligation bonds for various flood management programs. Bond money would be available to be spent by Department of Water Resources and for grants to local agencies. In order to spend these bonds funds, the measure requires the Legislature to appropriate them in the annual budget act or another law.

- ***Proposition 84 – Water Quality, Safety and Supply***

Staff Recommendation: No Position

Proposition 84 allows the state to sell \$5.4 billion in general obligation bonds for safe drinking water, water quality, and water supply; flood control; natural resource protection ; and park improvements. If approved by voters, bond money would be available for expenditure by various state agencies and for lands and grants, primarily to local agencies and nonprofit organizations. In order to spend most of these bond funds, the measure requires the Legislature to appropriate them in the annual budget act or other legislation.

Since 1996, voters have authorized approximately \$11 billion in general obligation bonds for various resources purposes. Of this amount, approximately \$1.4 billion is projected to remain available for new projects as of June 30, 2006, primarily for water-related purposes.

- ***Proposition 87 – Tax on Calif. Oil for Alternative Energy***

Staff Recommendation: No Position

In an effort to encourage the development and use of alternative energy, and reduce the use of petroleum in California by 25 percent from 2005 levels by 2017, Proposition 87 proposes a severance tax on oil production in California to generate revenues to fund \$4 billion in alternative energy programs over time. The severance tax would not apply to federal offshore production beyond three miles from the coast.

The measure stipulates the tax as a percentage based on cost of oil per barrel. Proposition 87 states that producers would not be allowed to pass on the cost of the severance tax to consumers through increased cost for oil, gasoline, or diesel fuel and places the oversight responsibility with the Board of Equalization. The proceeds of the severance tax would be deposited in a newly created fund called the California Energy Independence Fund and the revenues would not be eligible for loan or transfer to the state's General Fund. It is unclear how much funding, if any, the San Bernardino County region would receive should this measure pass.

Proposition 87 establishes a new California Energy Alternative Program Authority to spend the revenue generated from the severance tax within ten years of adopting a strategic plans and allows the Authority to issue bonds.

Supporters for Proposition 87 include Californians for Clean Energy. Opposition found on file includes the California State Association of Counties and Californians Against Higher Taxes. The League of California Cities took no position on this measure.

• ***Proposition 90 – Eminent Domain***

Staff Recommendation: Oppose

Also referred to as "The Protect Our Homes Act," this measure would amend the California Constitution to require government to pay property owners for substantial economic losses if it passes new laws or rules to acquire private property and establishes "just compensation" standards. Furthermore, Proposition 90 also limits the use of eminent domain to projects of public use.

Should Proposition 90 pass, the cost for right-of-way to build and complete transportation projects might rise significantly. Additionally, there is a potential that litigation for eminent domain may increase.

Supporters for this measure include Protect Our Homes Coalition. Opponents of Proposition 90 include CALGOG, California League of Cities, California State Association of Counties and Californians Against the Taxpayer Trap.

Financial Impact:

This item has no impact on the budget. Potential gains for transportation projects within San Bernardino County may be experienced, depending on voter approval of the 2006 statewide ballot initiatives.

Administrative Committee Agenda Item
September 20, 2006
Page 8

Reviewed By: This item is scheduled for review by the Administrative Committee on September 20, 2006.

Responsible Staff: Jennifer Franco, Director of Intergovernmental and Legislative Affairs

SANBAG Acronym List

1 of 2

| | |
|----------|--|
| AB | Assembly Bill |
| ACE | Alameda Corridor East |
| ACT | Association for Commuter Transportation |
| ADA | Americans with Disabilities Act |
| APTA | American Public Transportation Association |
| AQMP | Air Quality Management Plan |
| ATMIS | Advanced Transportation Management Information Systems |
| BAT | Barstow Area Transit |
| CAC | Call Answering Center |
| CALACT | California Association for Coordination Transportation |
| CALCOG | California Association of Councils of Governments |
| CALSAFE | California Committee for Service Authorities for Freeway Emergencies |
| CALTRANS | California Department of Transportation |
| CARB | California Air Resources Board |
| CEQA | California Environmental Quality Act |
| CHP | California Highway Patrol |
| CMAQ | Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality |
| CMP | Congestion Management Program |
| CNG | Compressed Natural Gas |
| COG | Council of Governments |
| CSAC | California State Association of Counties |
| CTA | California Transit Association |
| CTAA | Community Transportation Association of America |
| CTC | California Transportation Commission |
| CTC | County Transportation Commission |
| CTP | Comprehensive Transportation Plan |
| DMO | Data Management Office |
| DOT | Department of Transportation |
| E&H | Elderly and Handicapped |
| EIR | Environmental Impact Report |
| EIS | Environmental Impact Statement |
| EPA | United States Environmental Protection Agency |
| ETC | Employee Transportation Coordinator |
| FEIS | Final Environmental Impact Statement |
| FHWA | Federal Highway Administration |
| FSP | Freeway Service Patrol |
| FTA | Federal Transit Administration |
| FTIP | Federal Transportation Improvement Program |
| GFOA | Government Finance Officers Association |
| GIS | Geographic Information Systems |
| HOV | High-Occupancy Vehicle |
| ICMA | International City/County Management Association |
| ICTC | Interstate Clean Transportation Corridor |
| IEEP | Inland Empire Economic Partnership |
| ISTEA | Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 |
| IIP/ITIP | Interregional Transportation Improvement Program |
| ITS | Intelligent Transportation Systems |
| IVDA | Inland Valley Development Agency |
| JARC | Job Access Reverse Commute |
| LACMTA | Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority |
| LNG | Liquefied Natural Gas |
| LTF | Local Transportation Funds |
| MAGLEV | Magnetic Levitation |
| MARTA | Mountain Area Regional Transportation Authority |
| MBTA | Morongo Basin Transit Authority |
| MDAB | Mojave Desert Air Basin |
| MDAQMD | Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District |
| MIS | Major Investment Study |
| MOU | Memorandum of Understanding |

SANBAG Acronym List

2 of 2

| | |
|---------|---|
| MPO | Metropolitan Planning Organization |
| MSRC | Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee |
| MTP | Metropolitan Transportation Plan |
| NAT | Needles Area Transit |
| OA | Obligation Authority |
| OCTA | Orange County Transportation Authority |
| OWP | Overall Work Program |
| PA&ED | Project Approval and Environmental Document |
| PASTACC | Public and Specialized Transportation Advisory and Coordinating Council |
| PDT | Project Development Team |
| PPM | Planning, Programming and Monitoring Funds |
| PSR | Project Study Report |
| PTA | Public Transportation Account |
| PVEA | Petroleum Violation Escrow Account |
| RCTC | Riverside County Transportation Commission |
| RDA | Redevelopment Agency |
| RFP | Request for Proposal |
| RIP | Regional Improvement Program |
| ROD | Record of Decision |
| RTAC | Regional Transportation Agencies' Coalition |
| RTIP | Regional Transportation Improvement Program |
| RTP | Regional Transportation Plan |
| RTPA | Regional Transportation Planning Agencies |
| SB | Senate Bill |
| SAFE | Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies |
| SANBAG | San Bernardino Associated Governments |
| SCAB | South Coast Air Basin |
| SCAG | Southern California Association of Governments |
| SCAQMD | South Coast Air Quality Management District |
| SCRRA | Southern California Regional Rail Authority |
| SED | Socioeconomic Data |
| SHA | State Highway Account |
| SHOPP | State Highway Operations and Protection Program |
| SOV | Single-Occupant Vehicle |
| SRTP | Short Range Transit Plan |
| STAF | State Transit Assistance Funds |
| STIP | State Transportation Improvement Program |
| STP | Surface Transportation Program |
| TAC | Technical Advisory Committee |
| TCM | Transportation Control Measure |
| TCRP | Traffic Congestion Relief Program |
| TDA | Transportation Development Act |
| TEA | Transportation Enhancement Activities |
| TEA-21 | Transportation Equity Act for the 21 st Century |
| TIA | Traffic Impact Analysis |
| TMC | Transportation Management Center |
| TMEE | Traffic Management and Environmental Enhancement |
| TOC | Traffic Operations Center |
| TOPRS | Transit Operator Performance Reporting System |
| TSM | Transportation Systems Management |
| USFWS | United States Fish and Wildlife Service |
| UZAs | Urbanized Areas |
| VCTC | Ventura County Transportation Commission |
| VTA | Victor Valley Transit Authority |
| WRCOG | Western Riverside Council of Governments |

San Bernardino Associated Governments



MISSION STATEMENT

To enhance the quality of life for all residents, San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) will:

- Improve cooperative regional planning
- Develop an accessible, efficient, multi-modal transportation system
- Strengthen economic development efforts
- Exert leadership in creative problem solving

To successfully accomplish this mission, SANBAG will foster enhanced relationships among all of its stakeholders while adding to the value of local governments.

Approved June 2, 1993
Reaffirmed March 6, 1996